

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/842,935	04/26/2001	Michael Kozhukh	INTL-0561-US (P11332)	1185
75	590 10/23/2002			
Timothy N. Trop TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. STE 100			EXAMINER	
			CHANG, AUDREY Y	
110051011, 17	. ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		2872	
			DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		W			
	Application N .	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/842,935	KOZHUKH, MICHAEL			
Auvisory Action	Examin r	Art Unit			
	Audrey Y. Chang	2872			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondenc address			
THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2002 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	(1) a timely filed amendment wheal (with appeal fee); or (3) a tin	nich places the application in			
PERIOD FOR R	REPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
a) The period for reply expires					
37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply disginally set in the line of the line of the shortened statutory period for reply disginally set in the line of the li					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:	•			
(a) they raise new issues that would require fur	ther consideration and/or search	n (see NOTE below);			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without cand	celing a corresponding number of	of finally rejected claims.			
NOTE:		os uso 140 second perceraph			
3.⊠ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	ws:				
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6,8-13 and 16-30</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. Other:					
		Audrey Y. Chang Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2872			
I and the second		/III OIIII. 2012			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 09/842,935

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive to overcome the rejection. The structural relationships among the elements are essential because it is not clear if the absorbing layer is also covered by the insulator, this amounts to different properties. The applicant is respectfully reminded that it is well known in the art that the thickness of the layer determines the transmittance/reflectance/absorptance of a filt r. The cited Li reference teaches that the color coating layer comprises the same layer material as claimed and is designed as color filter for blue light which means it is capable of absorbing blue light. This implies the thickness of the layer is either implicitly of the cited thickness or in the order of the cited thickness in order to achieve as blue filter. With regard to claim 16, the examiner agrees the silver layer is formed directly on the silicon substrate however the specification fails to teach the criticality of such feature would overcome any problem in the prior art such as to use an adhesive layer for enhancing the adherence between the silver layer and the silicon substrate. Such modification is considered to be obvious matters of design choice. The applicant fails to provide arguments to respond such rejection as stated in the previous Office Action. The mirror comprising silver layer formed on the silicon substrate either directly or via an adhesive layer does not affect the property of the mirror. The specificaiton certainly fails to provide such difference to make an novel feature. Novelty is the essential feature for patent.